



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/764,299	01/19/2001	Hitoshi Ishida	2565-221P	6355
2292	7590	08/27/2003		
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			EXAMINER	
			BURGESS, BARBARA N	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2157		

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

3

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/764,299	ISHIDA ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Barbara N Burgess	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All
  - b) Some \*
  - c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
  - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>3</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to amendments filed May 27, 2003. Claims 1-20 are presented for further examination. Claims 21-26 were added and are presented for initial examination.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 6-18, and 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ilg et al. (hereinafter "Ilg", 4,829,297) in view of Gilbert et al. (hereinafter "Gilbert", 5,297,144).

As per claims 1 and 16, Ilg discloses a system for sending and receiving serial data comprising:

- A plurality of secondary stations each configured for receiving a refresh request and for sending one of data and response to a primary station (column 1, lines 20-23, column 2, lines 20-23, Figure 1);
- The primary station for sending the refresh request and a polling request asking for sending data, and for retrying one of the polling request and the refresh request

within the same determined time in case of failure of receiving one of the data and the response (column 1, lines 17-19, 36-38, column 2, lines 20-22, Figure 1);

- Retrying for sending one of the refresh request and the polling request to the secondary station which has not provided a normal response within a same determined time (column 4, lines 1-5, column 7, lines 53-55, 60-62, 68, column 8, lines 1-5, 20-23, column 9, lines 24-28).

Ilg does not explicitly disclose:

- A plurality of secondary stations each configured for receiving a synchronization request;
- The primary station further configured for sending the synchronization request simultaneously to the plurality of the secondary stations;

However, the use and advantages for implementing these steps is well known to one skilled in the relevant art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by teachings of Gilbert (column 3, lines 26-45, 55-68, column 7, lines 63-68, column 9, lines 35-41, column 10, lines 51-60).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement the primary station sending a synchronization request simultaneously to the secondary stations and in Ilg's method in order to define the start of a reservation request period allocating fixed time slots during which any remote station having a data message to transmit may request access and reserve a portion of the channel for their data messages.

As per claims 2 and 17, IIg discloses:

- The primary station includes a retry number counter for counting one of a polling request retried and a refresh request retried, wherein retrying of one of the polling request and the refresh request is stopped after one of a determined number and determined time has passed (column 5, lines 31-40, column 7, lines 5-8, 50-52, 55-63).

As per claim 3, IIg discloses:

- The primary station includes a record corresponding to each of the secondary stations, wherein a retry flag is set, when a normal response is not received, wherein the retry flag remains in the record corresponding to each of the secondary stations after stopping retrying of one of the polling request and the refresh request (column 4, lines 1-5, column 7, lines 53-55, 60-62, 68, column 8, lines 1-5, 20-23, column 9, lines 24-28).

As per claims 4 and 18, IIg discloses:

- The secondary station responds in a response frame of a compact type by using a flag code which is different from a flag code of the primary station (column 8, lines 7-9).

As per claims 6 and 20, IIg discloses:

Art Unit: 2157

- The primary station stores information on a type for each of the secondary stations, wherein the primary station skips sending the polling request in the determined time for the secondary station having failure to respond within the determined time (column 4, lines 1-5, column 7, lines 53-55, 60-62, 68, column 8, lines 1-5, 20-23, column 9, lines 24-28).

As per claim 7, IIg discloses:

- The primary station stores information on a type for each of the secondary stations, wherein the primary station ignores data from the secondary station having failure to respond within the determined time (column 4, lines 1-5, column 7, lines 53-55, 60-62, 68, column 8, lines 1-5, 20-23, column 9, lines 24-28)

As per claim 8, IIg discloses:

- The primary station stores an error state of each of the secondary stations, wherein the primary station sends an initialization request to the secondary station, when the secondary station in the error state returns to a normal response state (column 9, lines 14-38).

As per claim 9, IIg discloses:

- The primary station stores information of a type for each of the secondary stations, wherein the primary station collects information of the secondary station before

sending and compares the collected information with the information of the type before sending the initialization request (column 9, lines 14-38).

As per claim 10, IIg discloses:

- One of the primary station and the secondary station sends a high level signal for a short period after sending a frame (column 5, lines 19-28, 41-49).

As per claim 11, IIg discloses a system for sending and receiving serial data comprising:

- A primary station configured for sending a refresh request and a polling request in a specific order without having each secondary station address in determined time (column 1, lines 36-44);
- A plurality of secondary stations for responding to the primary station, following to the specific order (column 1, lines 36-47).

As per claim 12, IIg discloses:

- The secondary station has one of a counter and a time monitoring a response from another secondary station and time, and makes a response of its own station after one of a respectively set order and time (column 1, lines 36-47).

As per claim 13, IIg discloses:

- The secondary station has a monitoring responder for responding to the primary station in a determined order after the response time is passed in monitoring (column 5, lines 31-40).

As per claims 14 and 15, IIg discloses:

- The primary station provides a field for showing that a normal response to the refresh request for the secondary station can be skipped, wherein the secondary station stops a normal refresh response based on the field (column 5, lines 31-40);
- The primary station provides a field for showing that an error report from the secondary station is possible in the refresh response, wherein the secondary station has a monitor for monitoring an error in an own station, wherein the secondary station returns an error response based on the field (column 5, lines 31-40).

As per claims 21, 24, IIg discloses a system for sending and receiving serial data, comprising:

- A plurality of secondary stations configured to send data in response to one of a refresh request and a polling request (column 1, lines 20-23, column 2, lines 20-23, Figure 1);
- A master station operably connected to said secondary stations, said master station configured to perform the first and second sequence determinations in a predetermined fixed period of time (column 1, lines 17-19, 36-38, column 2, lines 20-22, Figure 1);

- Master station determining a first sequence of responses by sequentially sending one of a refresh request and a polling request to each secondary station and recording a response from each secondary station (column 1, lines 36-47, column 9, lines 14-38);
- Master station determining a second sequence of responses by sequentially sending one of the refresh request and the polling request to each secondary station associated with an abnormal response in the first sequence of responses ((column 4, lines 1-5, column 7, lines 53-55, 60-62, 68, column 8, lines 1-5, 20-23, column 9, lines 24-28).

As per claims 22 and 25, Ilg does not explicitly disclose:

- Each of the plurality of secondary stations is configured to prepare the data in response to a synchronization request;
- Master station is configured to simultaneously send the synchronization request to the plurality of the secondary stations.

However, the use and advantages for implementing these steps is well known to one skilled in the relevant art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by teachings of Gilbert (column 3, lines 26-45, 55-68, column 7, lines 63-68, column 9, lines 35-41, column 10, lines 51-60).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement the primary station sending a synchronization request simultaneously to the secondary stations and in Ilg's method in order to define

the start of a reservation request period allocating fixed time slots during which any remote station having a data message to transmit may request access and reserve a portion of the channel for their data messages.

As per claims 23 and 26, Ilg further discloses wherein the abnormal response includes a busy response and a time (column 8, lines 7-9).

3. Claims 5 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ilg et al. (hereinafter "Ilg", 4,829,297) in view of Gilbert et al. (hereinafter "Gilbert", 5,297,144) and in further view of Davis et al. (hereinafter "Davis", 4, 363, 093).

As per claims 5 and 19, Ilg, in view of Gilbert, does not explicitly disclose:

- The secondary station returns a busy response, when data for responding for the polling request from the primary station are failed to be prepared, wherein the primary station retries a polling request for the secondary station which has sent the busy response.

However, the use and advantages for the secondary station returning a busy response is well known to one skilled in the relevant art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by the teachings of Davis (column 38, lines 32-41).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate returning a busy signal in Ilg's

system in order to for the host processor to know that the status of the station is busy and a response cannot be provided.

***Response to Arguments***

**The Office notes the following arguments:**

- (a) Ilg fails to teach or suggest "the primary station...configured for sending the synchronization request simultaneously to the plurality of the secondary stations."
- (b) The table is maintained outside of any predetermined time. Thus, Ilg does not teach or suggest sending a refresh and polling requests in a specific order without having each secondary station address in determined time.
- (c) Ilg does not teach or suggest "the secondary station responds in a response frame of a compact type by using flag code which is different from a flag code of the primary system" as recited in claim 4, "the secondary station...monitoring...a response from another secondary station" as recited in claim 12, "the secondary station has a monitoring responder" as recited in claim 13, "wherein the primary station provides a field...the secondary station stops a normal refresh response based on the field" as recited in claim 14, and "responding in a response frame of a compact type from the secondary station by using a flag code which is different from a flag code of the primary station" as recited in claim 18.

**In response to:**

- (a) Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- (b) Ilg discloses polling the remote devices sequentially each one in order to determine whether or not they have information to transmit to the master. As well, Ilg

Art Unit: 2157

discloses dividing the remote station into two groups and the master station polling the stations sequentially. Therefore, IIg discloses a primary station configured for sending a refresh request and a polling request in a specific order without having each secondary station address in determined time (column 1, lines 36-44, column 2, lines 20-42).

(c) Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

### ***Conclusion***

1. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 6,192,417

U.S. Patent No. 6,351,769

U.S. Patent No. 6,374,293

U.S. Patent No. 5,694,543

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barbara N Burgess whose telephone number is (703) 305-3366. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00am-4:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Ettinene can be reached on (703) 308-7562. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Barbara N Burgess  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2157

\*\*\*

August 22, 2003

  
ARIO ETINENE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100